

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated July 30, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 30, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7-21 and 23-27 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 4, 8, 13, 17, 20, 24, 28, 32, 35 and 37 have been amended. Claims 6 and 22 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang et al.* (US 6,571,245; hereinafter *Huang*) in view of *Choung et al.* (US 6,487,195; hereinafter *Choung*). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Huang discloses a virtual desktop in a computer network. The virtual desktop is provided by a network of servers coupled to the Internet. (See, Abstract.) As suggested by the term "virtual" the applications and files of the virtual desktop are maintained on a network of servers but are accessible through any one of a variety of computer systems. (See, Figure 1.) The point of a virtual desktop is to provide a user with global accessibility to the applications and files of the virtual desktop, regardless of the computer being used to access the virtual desktop. (Column 5, lines 25-54.) Thus, *Huang* discloses a server-based network accessible by client computers (i.e., thin clients) to run applications and exchange information with the network and with one another. Accordingly, any file sharing performed between the client computers necessarily occurs through the server-based network and does not occur directly between the client computers. As such, the client computers do not communicate with one another, but rather request information from the server-based network that provides the virtual desktop. In contrast, the present claims recite browser information being transmitted from the computer on which the browser information originates to specified (i.e., targeted) computers. *Huang* does not disclose such peer-to-peer communications. In fact, such communications are an impossibility for *Huang* because such communications undermine the file synchronization feature of *Huang*. (See, Column 11, lines 44-46 and Column 12, lines 35-37.)

In contrast, *Choung* discloses a collaborative network navigation synchronization mechanism. The objective of *Choung* is to "propagate network navigation experience and information among a group of people who are geographically dispersed." (Col. 1, lines 36-38.) Accordingly, synchronization of a desktop environment by way of synchronization of files is not an objective of *Choung*. Furthermore, the references are distinctly different in that *Huang* is directed to synchronizing a given user's files on a server so that the user has access to the same desktop environment no matter which device the user accesses the desktop environment from. Thus, *Huang* is necessarily specific to a single user environment. In contrast, *Choung* is necessarily specific to a multiuser environment. File synchronization between multiple users is nonsensical in the context of *Huang*, and network navigation synchronization between a single user is nonsensical in the context of *Choung*. Therefore, the references are incompatibly disparate and, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the references are not in the same field of endeavor. Accordingly, no motivation to combine is present. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's basis for motivation is conclusory, circular and ambiguous. The Examiner states that "the specifying step in *Choung* in the process of sharing user-configured browser information between two browsers in *Huang*" would have been obvious "because the use of specifying step would allow to [sic] synchronize the network navigation with convenience, efficiency and accuracy." (Examiner's Action, Paper 4, page 4.) Applicants respectfully submit that this statement is nothing more than an unsupported generalization since the Examiner does not explain how the proposed combination would achieve "convenience, efficiency and accuracy." By all appearances, *Choung* already achieves these performance attributes and the combination with *Huang* does nothing to further these attributes. Further, the Examiner's statement is a proposal that *Choung*'s own specifying step is what would result in the "convenience, efficiency and accuracy" of synchronizing the network navigation performed by *Choung*. Respectfully, this is circular reasoning because the Examiner suggests that a step that *Choung* already performs would lead to an improvement in performance in *Choung*.

The incompatibility between the references is particularly highlighted with respect to various dependent claims. For example, claim 8 recites sending an electronic mail

message containing the user-configured browser information. In *Choung*, sending the synchronization information via electronic mail renders the network navigation synchronization feature of *Choung* inoperable. This is because *Choung* requires a network connection between the "leading terminal" and the "following terminals" that allows real-time, instantaneous data communications. An email requires that a user of the receiving computer access a mail server to retrieve the email and then open the email.

Further, Applicants submit that with regard to synchronization of browsers, *Huang* is limited to bookmarks. (See, e.g., col 12, line 39 through col. 13, line 14.) The present claims are directed to bookmarks and user-preferences. Therefore, the rejection is believed to be improper and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claims 1, 13, 17, 28 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Mullen-Schultz* (US 6,393,462). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. *Mullen-Schultz* discloses sharing bookmarks. The present claims are now directed to exchange of bookmarks and user-preferences between browsers. Therefore, the rejection is believed to be improper and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.


The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the Final Office Action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Final Office Action.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000104US1

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)